Technology Working Group

Summary List of Ideas

The purpose of this summary list is to provide meaningful examples of ideas for changing the Consolidated Plan process as developed by the CPII Technology Working Group. These ideas are being forwarded to the CPII Steering Committee with the ultimate objective of forwarding to HUD's Assistant Secretary of Community Planning and Development for possible action. These ideas relate to changes that may be administrative, regulatory or statutory in nature.

Working Group Profile:

Co-Chairs: Dee Ann Ducote, Hickory Hurie
Members: Kathryn Nelson, Michael Martin, Wendy Cairns, Hermelinda Rendon, Randy Patterson, David Chase, Millicent Grant, John Cook, Hohn Greiner, Dionne Roberts, Anita Crosby, Jeanette Harris, Sal Sclafani, Clete Houdek, Robyne Doten, Marcia Bergeson, Jim Smith
Meeting Dates: June 28, July 12, July 23, Aug 6, Aug 20, Aug 28

Pilot Recommendations

1. **Pilot 1 Idea –**

   Discussion:

   - General description. The Technology Working Group proposes an automated system that can be used by grantees for creating and submitting the Consolidated Plan, the Annual Action Plans and the Performance Reports. It would also be used by the HUD Field Staff for reviewing the same submissions. The system will bring forward data from earlier stages of reporting to eliminate re-entry of data. The system would be developed with keen attention to capturing only the statutory and regulatory data elements with the objective of minimizing narratives and optimizing the use of numerical data. For the pilot, the system could be created with an Access database. If successful as a pilot, the system could be migrated to a Web-based system when implemented by HUD. The Tech Working Group has a PowerPoint file that illustrates the proposed tool with screen captures of such a system. A member of the group has offered to see if her municipality would donate system development labor to create a pilot version of the tool.

     The group will submit to the Steering Committee two documents in advance of the September 10 meeting – a white paper on this pilot recommendation and a Data Elements Spreadsheet that shows the tracking of required data elements from the Consolidated Plan through the Annual Action Plans and Performance Reporting.

   - Goal: streamlining, reducing administrative burden.

   - Volunteers: Madison, Wisconsin. Grantees who do a ConPlan in 2003 should be considered and given the opportunity to pilot the tool.

General Discussion Ideas (These are ideas that don't fit into any of above categories)

1. Idea number 1– Use of various tools that are successfully in use by grantees.

Discussion
The working group evaluated several tools that are in use by grantees in the field or proposed by HUD. The system proposed as the Technology Working Group's pilot will use these tools as examples of the desired format for input screens and output reports of the system. For example, the New Consolidated Plan Template created by HUD will help to develop the Consolidate Plan data input screens and Madison, Wisconsin's method for displaying annual action plan progress against the five-year goal will help to create a report of the system.

The tools evaluated by the group included:
- HUD's New Consolidated Plan Template
- Milwaukee, Wisconsin's Assessment of Five-Year Goals & Objectives/Accomplishments 2000-2004
- Columbus, Ohio's APR Tool
- Madison, Wisconsin's Web page Results 2000-2004
- State of Wisconsin's State Grant Performance/Evaluation Report
- Los Angeles County's CAPER System
- San Francisco, California's spreadsheet
- Clark County, Nevada's Word template
- Arlington County, VA spreadsheet
- Dee Ann Ducote's template
- HUD's CAPER tables